



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,005	09/28/2001	David Bruce Kumhyr	AUS9-2001-0766-US1	4840

7590 07/12/2005

Leslie A. Van Leeuwen
International Business Machines Corporation
Intl Prop Law Dept., Internal Zip 4054
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER

TO, JENNIFER N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/966,005

Applicant(s)

KUMHYR ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer N. To

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

ps

Art Unit: 2195

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-33 are pended for examination.
2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
3. The title is too long. A new title is required that is as short and specific as possible.
4. The cross reference related to the application cited in the specification must be updated (i.e. update the relevant status, with PTO serial numbers or patent numbers where appropriate, on page 1, line 14. The entire specification should be so revised).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 6-8, 12, 17-19, 23, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grundy ("Visual Specification And monitoring Of

Art Unit: 2195

Software Agents In Decentralized Process Centered Environments”, published November 3rd 1998).

7. Grundy was cited in the last office action.

8. As per claim 1, Grundy teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a computer controlled user interactive display system for dynamically tracking and controlling the building of software program objects comprising:

means for tracking each of a plurality of sets of sequential build events, each set of sequential build events respectively building a program object (page 4, lines 19-26 and page 6, lines 1-8);

means for displaying each of said sets of sequential build events (page 5, line 2 and page 6, line 15); and

means associated with each of said displayed sequential build events enabling any one of a plurality of users to interactively register to perform an action on said build event (fig. 3; page 5, lines 4-5).

Grundy did not specifically teach the mean for associate with each of said displayed sequential build events enabling a user to interactively unregister to perform an action on said build events.

Art Unit: 2195

9. However, Grundy disclosed the enactments/deenactments by the users when the system is in finish stage (figures 3 & 10, page 5, lines 4-5, and page 14, lines 3-4).

10. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that once there is an option for a user to register for performing an action, there would be an option for a user to unregister too. Doing so would ease the control of information access and usage (page 5, line 5).

11. As per claim 6, Grundy further teaches that said registered action is notice to the registered user of a state in a build event (page 8, lines 18-20).

12. As per claim 7, Grundy further teaches that another registered action may be selectively performed by the registered user (page 13, lines 1-3).

13. As per claim 8, Grundy further teaches:

the registered user is a manager of the building of a program object (page 2, lines 30-33, 37-38);

the state in a build event is a request of another user to register or unregister (page 9, lines 9-11); and

the selective action performed by said manager is the authorization of the request (page 11, lines 27-29, 36-40 and page 12, lines 1-3).

Art Unit: 2195

14. As per claims 12 and 23, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

15. As per claims 17-19 and 27-30, they are rejected with the same reason as claims 6-8 above.

16. Claims 2-5, 9-11, 13-16, 20-22, 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grundy as applied to claims 1, 12 and 23 above in view of Notess et al. (hereafter Notess) (U.S. Patent No. 5438659).

17. Notess was cited in the last office action.

18. As per claim 2, Grundy teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Grundy did not specifically teach means for determining whether the user is authorized to perform said action.

19. However Notess teaches means for determining whether the user is authorized to perform said action (figure 3; col. 7, lines 66-68 and col. 8, lines 1-7).

20. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Grundy and Notess because Notess's determining step would improve the security of Grundy's

Art Unit: 2195

system by having addition step of determining whether user is an authorized user (Notess, col. 8, lines 51-52).

21. As per claim 3, it is rejected base on claim 2.

22. As per claim 4, Notess teaches means responsive to a state in a build event for automatically performing a registered action on said build event (col. 12, lines 8-11 and col. 12, lines 36-39).

23. As per claim 5, Notess teaches means responsive to a state in a build event for enabling a user to selectively perform a registered action on said build event (col. 12, lines 15-18).

24. As per claim 9, Notess teaches:

means enabling a user to selectively request a displayed data entry dialog box (col. 9, lines 65-69 and col. 10, lines 1-2); and

means for determining from the data entered in said box whether the user is authorized to unregister to perform an action (col. 9, lines 3-12).

25. As per claim 10, Grundy teaches means for tracking a sequence of build events in the building of a program object (page 6, lines 1-8); and means for displaying each of said sequence build events (page 5, line 2 and page 6 line 15).

Art Unit: 2195

In additional Notess teaches a menu of actions said user may selectively perform on the associated build event at the current state of the event (col. 7, lines 17-22); and data entry means enabling the user to request registration to perform an action on the build event or unregistration to perform an action on the build event (col. 6, lines 57-62).

26. As per claim 11, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 10 above.

27. Claims 13-16 and 24-27 are rejected for the same reason as claims 2-5 above.

28. Claims 20-22 and 31-33 are rejected for the same reason as claims 9-11 above.

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant's arguments filed 05/16/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

30. In the remarks applicant argued:

(1) Grundy fails to teach a shared work project.

(2) Grundy fails to teach a user may interactively with respect to a display screen selectively register to do specific actions to any one event in one set of sequences in the building program objects.

Art Unit: 2195

(3) Grundy fails to teach unregister with respect to a specific action.

(4) Grundy fails to teach one of the registered users is the manager of the building of one of the sets of events to produce one of the objects.

(5) Notess disclosed an authorization implementation but not any way related to any registration/unregistration of action.

(6) Notess disclosed that actions may be triggered by event states but nothing related to any registration/unregistration of action.

(7) Notess fails to teach a user may have the option of selectively having a registered action performed in response to a triggering event.

(8) Notess fails to teach the determination of whether a user is authorized to register to perform specific actions.

(9) Notess fails to teach the action selectable to be registered are set forth in a menu associated with each build event in a sequence of build events.

31. Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's remarks:

- a. As to point (1), Grundy teaches a shared work project (page 1, lines 30-31).
- b. As to point (2), Grundy teaches a user may interactively with respect to a display screen selectively register to do specific actions to any one event in one set of sequences in the building program objects (fig. 3).
- c. As to point (3), Grundy did not specifically teach un-register with respect to a specific action. However, Grundy disclosed an option for user to deselect or undo any building program objects with respect to a specific

action (fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that deselecting and undoing any building program objects with respect to a specific action act in fact is un-registering any building program objects with respect to a specific action. Therefore one would be motivated to use Grundy's system to ease the control of information access and usage (page 5, line 5).

- d. As to point (4), Grundy teaches one of the registered users is the manager of the building of one of the sets of events to produce one of the objects (fig. 2 & 3; page 2, lines 14-15, 30-40).
- e. As to points (5)-(9), these claims are rejected base on a combination of references. Therefore applicant cannot attack the references individual.
- f. As to point (5), Notess teaches an authorization implementation (figure 3; col. 7, lines 66-68 and col. 8, lines 1-7). Grundy teaches registration/unregistration of action (fig. 3).
- g. As to point (6), Notess teaches actions may be triggered by event states (col. 12, lines 8-11 and col. 12, lines 36-39). Grundy teaches registration/unregistration of action (fig. 3).
- h. As to point (7), Notess teaches a registered action performed in response to a triggering event (col. 12, lines 15-18). Grundy teaches a user may have the option of selectively (fig. 3 & 10).

Art Unit: 2195

- i. As to point (8), Notess teaches the determination of whether a user is authorized to perform specific actions (figure 3; col. 7, lines 66-68 and col. 8, lines 1-7). Grundy teaches environment like registration (fig. 3).
- j. As to point (9), Notess teaches a menu associated with each build event in a sequence of build events (col. 7, lines 17-22; col. 6, lines 57-62). Grundy teaches the actions selectable to register (fig. 3).

32. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer N. To whose telephone number is (571) 272-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 7AM- 4:30 PM, F 7AM- 3:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2195

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


MENG-AI AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Jennifer N To
Examiner
Art Unit 2195